

Sinclair  
Broadcasting's  
decision to force  
their stations to  
air an anti-Kerry  
documentary days  
before the election  
is a clear example  
of the dangers of  
media consolidation.

How can you define  
this program as a  
documentary? I  
don't understand how  
this could be  
considered more in  
the "public  
interest" than  
airing the program  
which read off our  
deceased soldiers  
names. I don't  
believe this program  
to be news that  
should be aired in  
place of regular  
programming.

Sinclair uses the  
public airwaves free  
of charge, and is  
obligated by law to  
serve the public  
interest. But when  
large companies  
control the  
airwaves, we get  
more of what's good  
for the bottom line  
and less of what we  
need for our  
democracy. Instead  
of something  
produced at "News  
Central" far away,  
it's more important  
that we see real  
people from our own  
communities and more  
substantive news  
about issues that  
matter.

Sinclair's actions  
show why we need to  
strengthen media  
ownership rules, not

weaken them. They  
show why the license  
renewal process  
needs to involve  
more than a returned  
postcard. Thank you.